



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/182,842	10/29/1998	SUNNY BEHL	033129-001	2460
24214	7590	07/28/2003		
JAMES D IVEY 3025 TOTTERDELL STREET OAKLAND, CA 94611-1742			EXAMINER	
			ABRAMS, NEIL	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2839		

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Filed 1-28-'03  
Ken Four +"

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	Examiner <i>N. Abrams</i>	Group Art Unit <i>2839</i>

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5-23-03 (CPA)

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

Claim(s) 1, 3-11, 13 - 18 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1, 3-11, 13 - 18 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement

**Application Papers**

The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved.

The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)**

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).

All  Some\*  None of the:

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received  
in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

**Attachment(s)**

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892  Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948  Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Office Action Summary**

Art Unit: 2839

Filing of a CPA is acknowledged. A first action follows.

Claim 1 is objected to ,line 7 "the front has....slots" seems unclear. The slots are in the card device not the carrier. Claim 15, line 7 is unclear and "the ....slots" has no antecedent basis.

Claims 1, 3-11,13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pollard in view of Darden, Uwabo and Iwasaki..

Pollard discloses a system with memory storage docking assembly or bay 12, a carrier 22, a combined disk drive and card device 10 and fan 28. The system lacks rails and the carrier front at 30 has opening for only a single card slot 11. Circuitry is standard in such system. If at issue use of such circuitry also suggested by Darden at 73 . Obvious to use such circuitry in Pollard as necessary for operation . It would have been obvious to add rails at 12 and 22 in view of Darden at 54,121 and to add a second card slot in view of Uwabo and Iwasaki. Rails would aid guidance of the carrier and added slots would enable more functions to be performed. Term "offset" is too general to overcome the reference teachings. In addition obvious to use offset slots in view of Iwasaki at 31,34. This feature would be inherent if different size cards were used. This claim1 discussion basically covers other included claims. For claims 6,14,16,17, also obvious to add a lock and handle in view of Darden. This would aid in securement `and removal of the carrier. For claim 6 folding handles are very well known ,used typically for sliding drawers in cabinets.

Claims 15,16,17,18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaneda in view of Darden, Japan 427and Iwasaki. .

Art Unit: 2839

Kaneda, see figs 2,3,4-7, discloses carriers 7' 7" enclosing card devices 2 and 16,17 each with plural card slots and the carrier for being received in a computer bay. Kaneda does not disclose use of rails or of handles. Darden discloses these features, as discussed above and Japan see fig 15 discloses use of rails to guide a carrier.. Obvious to add such features to Kaneda carrier 7' or 7" for reasons noted above. The Kaneda card slots 25, 26 ,fig 7 and in fig 2 are readable as being offset. In addition it also would have been obvious to use card slots offset as in Iwasaki at 31,34. this change has not been shown to produce any stated unobvious result over non-offset slots. For claim 18, only the pc card device is being claimed and computer system details cannot be relied upon for patentability.

Claims 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harari in view of Japan 427, Darden and Iwasaki.

Harari discloses a system with host 200 and a part 10 fig 8B read as a combined carrier and card device with circuitry 19 on board 18. Harari does not disclose rails or handle use. It would have been obvious to use rails and for claims 16,17 , a handle in view of Darden at 54,121,41 and Japan fig 15. These teachings are applicable for reasons noted above. Iwasaki applied as discussed above. Note that Harari discusses his combined card as a replacement for other memory devices.

Art Unit: 2839

Applicant's arguments filed with the amendment have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. \*The arguments as to claim readability are responded to above\*\*The claims do not define over card devices fixed by fasteners or equivalent as in Pollard and Kaneda. Terms "mounted in" as in claim15 only require the parts to be joined together or to form a unit.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at telephone number 703-308-1729.

Kaneda , et al. 5,304,933, col. 1, lines 17', 17" and ring card devices 2



NEIL ABRAMS  
EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 322